



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/580,403 | 08/18/2006 | Hiroshi Kubo | Q94683 | 2089 |
| 23373 | 7590 | 10/08/2009 | | |
| SUGHRUE MION, PLLC | | | EXAMINER | |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. | | | VAKILI, ZOHREH | |
| SUITE 800 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20037 | | | 1614 | |
| | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | 10/08/2009 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| 10/580,403 | KUBO ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| ZOHREH VAKILI | 1614 | |

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 31 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 10,11 and 22-25

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-9 and 12-21.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Ardin Marschel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1614

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment will not be entered into the record because of the addition of the new limitations that have raised new issues. Accordingly, Applicant's remarks regarding the Examiner has overlooked his remarks is not correct. Examiner has provided a new rejection. Very clearly this states that arguments become moot when there is a new rejection based on arguments anew rejection was provided. The anticipation rejection over Fuji et al. and the obviation rejection Mae et al. and in view of JP 52042837 of the rejections of record under 103 in view of the amendments are also not found persuasive, because the proposed after final amendments will not be entered into the record. However, Applicant's remarks regarding the rejection of the claims over the rejection under 102 and 103 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. In particular, it is *prima facie* obvious to combine a known compound in treating the disease that is already known to be treated by the same compound of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, Applicant's invention and the prior art are such that they would have been modifications that were *prima facie* obvious to the skilled artisan. It is noted that the claimed invention is not required to be expressly suggested in its entirety by any one or all of the references cited under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In the present case, for example JP 52042837 merely relied upon to show that this compound has been used in treating liver disease even though the liver disease is cirrhosis of liver it is still a liver disease that has been treated by this compound the increase in GPT or GOT activity these liver's biomarkers once there is a problem there is an increase in GPT or GOT activities in blood and when a compound is found to treat a liver disease will inherently affect the liver biomarkers and the GPT or GOT activities will decrease in blood. Applicant's amendments and remarks have been carefully considered in their entirety, but fail to be persuasive in establishing error in the propriety of the present rejection. For these reasons, rejection of the claims 10, 11, and 22-25 remains proper.

/Zohreh Vakili/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1614